## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH CENTRAL DIVISION

RICHARD C. BEALS and CHERYL J. BEALS,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 2:10-cv-787-CW

V.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE and UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH,

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO STAY THE CASE

Before the Court is Plaintiff Richard Beals' Motion to Stay this case. (Docs. 10, 19.) Because Mr. Beals' is proceeding prose, the Court construes his pleadings liberally. See Ledbetter v. City of Topeka, Kansas, 318 F.3d 1183, 1187 (10th Cir. 2003).

"When applying for a stay, a party must show 'a clear case of hardship or inequity' if 'even a fair possibility' exists that the stay would damage another party.'" Ben Ezra, Weinstein, & Co. v. Am. Online Inc., 206 F.3d 980, 987 (10th Cir. 2000) (quoting Span-Eng Assocs. v. Weidner, 771 F.2d 464, 468 (10th Cir. 1985)).

Mr. Beals has not met his burden in bringing this motion; he has not shown he will suffer any hardship or inequity if these proceedings are not stayed pending Judge Jenkins' ruling

regarding Mr. Beals' motion for appointment of counsel in a separate proceeding.

As Defendants argued in their memorandum (Doc. 11, at 3),
Judge Jenkins has no authority to appoint counsel in this civil
matter, a proceeding over which Judge Jenkins is not presiding.
Furthermore, the Court has already issued an order denying Mr.
Beals' motion for appointment of counsel in this case (Doc. 20.)
because it found that appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time.

Because Mr. Beals has not demonstrated that he will suffer any hardship or inequity if this proceeding is not stayed, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that his motion to stay these proceedings (Docs. 10, 19) is DENIED.

DATED this 6th day of January, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

SAMUEL ALBA

United States Magistrate Judge